



# **SELECTION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY**

**for applications submitted to the  
INTERREG Austria-Hungary 2021-2027 Programme**



# Project selection in the programme INTERREG Austria-Hungary 2021-2027

Project selection is based on two sets of criteria:

1. administrative and eligibility criteria,
2. quality assessment criteria.

**Administrative and eligibility criteria** have to be fulfilled by every project proposal; they are “knock-out” criteria. They do not measure the quality of the project or its content. Only if all administrative and eligibility criteria are fulfilled a project will proceed to the Monitoring Committee (MC) for decision.

**Quality assessment criteria** measure the relevance and feasibility of the project. This is reflected in two types of assessment criteria. Strategic assessment criteria are meant to determine the extent of the project’s contribution to the achievement of the programme objectives. A strong focus is given to the result orientation of a project with the demand for visible outputs and concrete results. Operational assessment criteria review the viability and feasibility of the proposed project, as well as its value for money in terms of resources used versus results delivered.

In line with its Rules of Procedure, these selection criteria and methodology are subject to approval by the MC<sup>1</sup>.

## 1 Administrative and eligibility assessment

In line with the requirements for e-cohesion, **applications** in the Interreg Austria-Hungary 2021-2027 Programme **can only be submitted via the programme’s electronic monitoring system, Jems**. Jems applies certain pre-submission verifications<sup>2</sup> that prevent applicants to submit applications with obvious formal errors. In addition to pre-submission checks that are targeted to technical details (such as mandatory fields must not remain empty) formal/administrative criteria by the programme are also checked – where this is technically possible – via pre-submission verifications, or are built in requirements such as submission by the set deadline. These administrative criteria are included in Table 1.

Other administrative and eligibility criteria are subject to check by the programme’s Joint Secretariat, following the submission of the application for funding – these are listed in Table 2. All questions in the list of administrative and eligibility criteria must be answered with yes/no (for exception related to criteria B.1.4 see footnote 8). In line with B.1 of the administrative and eligibility criteria Member State representatives and Regional Coordinators contribute to the assessment procedure.

If, during the assessment, it is found that any of the administrative or eligibility criteria are not met, the applicant will receive a letter with a request for clarification and completion of missing documents. If any of the criteria are not met within the deadline for amendment, the project cannot be submitted for decision to the MC.

Those project applications that fully comply with the administrative and eligibility criteria will be subject to quality assessment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pre-submission checks of technical nature, included in the section A.7 are exempt from approval by the MC – in case of changes in the content of such pre-submission checks the MC should be informed.

<sup>2</sup> Standard Jems pre-submission verifications are available at the Jems Portal: <https://jems.interact-eu.net/manual/>.



**Table 1** Pre-submission verifications in Jems

Nº.	Administrative criteria	Description of Jems criteria or pre-submission verification		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
<b>A.1</b>	The application is submitted by the set deadline.	<p><i>Continuous submission.</i></p> <p><i>In general, applications submitted via Jems to the Joint Secretariat at latest by noon, 70 days before the MC meeting will be evaluated and – if eligible – proposed to the MC for decision. The MC can decide about a different (longer or shorter) time period for project submission. In any case the latest date of submission for projects to be proposed to the MC is published on the programme webpage, and the upcoming Jems submission deadline is configured accordingly.</i></p>		
<b>A.2</b>	The project fulfils minimum requirements for partnership.	<p><i>The following partnership-related requirements have to be fulfilled:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. At least one Austrian and one Hungarian partner are involved.</i></li> <li><i>2. One of the partners has to be lead partner (Austrian or Hungarian).</i></li> </ol>	<p><i>The following partnership related requirements have to be fulfilled:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. At least one Austrian and one Hungarian partner are involved.</i></li> <li><i>2. One of the partners has to be lead partner (Austrian or Hungarian).</i></li> <li><i>3. Small-scale projects do not include more than 3 partners.</i></li> </ol>	



Nº.	Administrative criteria	Description of Jems criteria or pre-submission verification		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
<b>A.3</b>	The project fulfils minimum requirements for content.	<p><i>The following content-related requirements have to be fulfilled:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The project is assigned to a programme priority and a specific objective.</i></li> <li><i>The project work plan includes at least one, but not more than five work package(s), each with a linked project specific objective and a communication objective.</i></li> <li><i>The project work plan includes at least one output with a positive target value, linked to one of the programme output indicators. The selection of RCO87 is compulsory. Standard projects must select at least one further output indicator.</i></li> <li><i>Outputs are delivered at latest during the period when activities within the respective work package end.</i></li> <li><i>All activities lead to at least one deliverable.</i></li> <li><i>The project work plan shall include at least one result with a positive target value, linked to one of the programme result indicators. The selection of RCR84 is compulsory. Standard projects must select at least one further result indicator, linked to the selected output indicator.</i></li> <li><i>The baseline for result indicators must always be 0.</i></li> <li><i>At least 3 cooperation criteria should be selected, "Joint development" and "Joint implementation" are mandatory.</i></li> <li><i>Unless a project partner selects the 40% "Other costs flat rate", the flat rates for the cost categories "Office and administration cost" and "Travel and accommodation costs" are obligatory and have to be both selected.</i></li> </ol>	<p><i>The following content-related requirements have to be fulfilled:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The project is assigned to a programme priority and a specific objective.</i></li> <li><i>The project work plan includes exactly one work package with a linked project specific objective and a communication objective.</i></li> <li><i>The project work plan includes at least one output with a positive target value, linked to one of the programme output indicators. The selection of RCO87 is compulsory.</i></li> <li><i>Outputs are delivered at latest during the period when activities within the respective work package end.</i></li> <li><i>All activities lead to at least one deliverable.</i></li> <li><i>The project work plan shall include at least one result with a positive target value, linked to one of the programme result indicators. The selection of RCR84 is compulsory.</i></li> <li><i>The baseline for result indicators must always be 0.</i></li> <li><i>At least 3 cooperation criteria should be selected, "Joint development" and "Joint implementation" are mandatory.</i></li> <li><i>Unless a project partner selects the 40% "Other costs flat rate", the flat rates for the cost categories "Office and administration cost" and "Travel and accommodation costs" are obligatory and have to be both selected.</i></li> <li><i>Small-scale projects do not include investment in infrastructure and works (or costs in the respective category).</i></li> </ol>	



N <sup>o</sup> .	Administrative criteria	Description of Jems criteria or pre-submission verification		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
<b>A.4</b>	Time limits are respected.	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>The time limit for small-scale projects is respected (maximum duration 18 months).</i>	
<b>A.5</b>	Minimum and maximum budget requirements are respected including percentage of co-financing.	<p><i>The following budget-related requirements have to be fulfilled:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The support from the ERDF does not exceed 80% of the partner's total budget.</i></li> <li><i>2. Min. 20% of partner total budget is secured by national contribution(s)<sup>3</sup></i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. in the form of own resources (public or private) of the partner,</i></li> <li><i>b. and/or as third-party financial contribution (public or private), including government contribution<sup>4</sup> for Hungarian project partners.</i></li> </ol> </li> <li><i>3. The total project budget for standard projects exceeds EUR 200 000 total costs but is not more than EUR 3 000 000.</i></li> <li><i>4. Preparation costs for a standard project (with a total budget exceeding EUR 200 000) amount to a lump sum of EUR 6 300 (total costs).</i></li> </ol>	<p><i>The following budget-related requirements have to be fulfilled:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The support from the ERDF does not exceed 80% of the partner's total budget.</i></li> <li><i>2. Min. 20% of partner total budget is secured by national contribution(s)<sup>3</sup></i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. in the form of own resources (public or private) of the partner,</i></li> <li><i>b. and/or as third-party financial contribution (public or private), including government contribution<sup>4</sup> for Hungarian project partners.</i></li> </ol> </li> <li><i>3. The total budget of small-scale projects is least EUR 25 000 but not more than EUR 200 000.</i></li> <li><i>4. Preparation costs for a small-scale project (with a total budget of not more than EUR 200 000) amount to a lump sum of EUR 3 000 (total costs).</i></li> </ol>	
<b>A.6</b>	Article 53 (2) of CPR is respected.	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Beneficiaries of small-scale projects shall use SCOs offered by the programme to the fullest possible extent. Real costs shall be possible only when direct costs are used as the basis of staff or other costs flat rate option. I.e. the partner budget must either use the staff flat rate option (based on real costs in services and equipment) or the 40% other cost flat rate (as a percentage of staff costs on unit cost basis).</i>	

<sup>3</sup> Concerning required documentation of national financial contribution(s) see the section about obligatory annexes.

<sup>4</sup> For specific rules about Hungarian government contribution see the Application Manual / Eligibility Manual.



Nº.	Administrative criteria	Description of Jems criteria or pre-submission verification		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
<b>A.7</b>	Technical pre-submission checks:	<p><i>The following technical pre-submission checks have to be complied with:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The application complies with standard (built in) Jems pre-submission verifications (see footnote 2).</i></li> <li><i>2. The lump sum financing of preparation costs is linked in Jems to the period "Preparation".</i></li> <li><i>3. Only one preparation cost lump sum can be added.</i></li> <li><i>4. If the financing of the partner budget includes own resources, the "Legal status of the contribution" equals the "Legal status" of the partner – either public or private.</i></li> <li><i>5. Zip codes must comply with the pre-defined format (4 digits both in Austria and in Hungary).</i></li> <li><i>6. All Hungarian project partners have a tax ID.</i></li> <li><i>7. Austrian partners must either have a UID number or some other unique ID.</i></li> <li><i>8. VAT ID (tax ID or UID) must comply with the predefined format (ATU + 8 digits, e.g. ATU12345678 for Austrian partners, and 8 digits – 1 digit – 2 digits, e.g. 12345678-1-12 for Hungarian partners).</i></li> <li><i>9. Only the appropriate staff hourly rates can be selected (acc. member state and the acc. proper indexed version – if relevant).</i></li> </ol>		



Table 2 Administrative and eligibility criteria to be checked by the Joint Secretariat

Nº.	Administrative and eligibility criteria	Description for the checks by the Joint Secretariat		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
B.1	Obligatory annexes are attached to the application form.	<p>Obligatory annexes must be signed by the authorised signatory, scanned and attached to the electronic AF and be submitted by the deadline. In case the applicant uses electronic signature, the file bearing electronic signature shall be submitted.</p> <p>Obligatory annexes, to be attached to all project applications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lead partner and partner declarations according to the programme’s template,</li> <li>2. partnership agreement<sup>5</sup>,</li> <li>3. declaration about financing contribution(s) (issued by the partner organisation in case of own resources and/or by the financing organisation in case of third-party contribution)<sup>6,7</sup>,</li> <li>4. de-minimis declaration<sup>8</sup>.</li> </ol> <p>Representatives of the member states and regional coordinators shall be invited to check to their best knowledge of the applicants and the planned operations, also using available open databases etc., that there is <b>no evidence of facts contradicting</b> the content of the lead partner and partner declarations (or declarations within the partnership agreement). Such issues concern especially, but not exclusively declarations about <b>double financing, operations relocated</b>, contradiction with <b>corresponding strategies</b>, project <b>completed/implemented before submission</b>, or concerned by <b>infringement</b>, etc.</p>		

<sup>5</sup> The signed partnership agreement is a mandatory annex from the date when the template by the programme becomes available (expected for the second submission round).

<sup>6</sup> If the financial commitment of a municipality, or (in Hungary) of a micro-regional association is bound to a municipality resolution or to a similar document by national legislation, this must be also attached.

<sup>7</sup> No declaration is needed about the Hungarian government contribution.

<sup>8</sup> In exceptional cases, if a partner has not submitted the de-minimis declaration, the project can be considered as formally compliant under the condition that the partner concerned does not receive de-minimis support for the submitted project.





Nº.	Administrative and eligibility criteria	Description for the checks by the Joint Secretariat		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
<b>B.2</b>	Supporting documents are attached to the application form.	<p><i>Supporting documents if the staff flat rate is applied:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>declaration of the relevant institution about the number of employees covered by social insurance<sup>9</sup>.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Supporting documents for projects including investment in infrastructure and works:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>proof of property/rights of use<sup>10</sup>,</i></li> <li><i>plans that enable a proper cost calculation, incl. division of infrastructure costs between programmes/projects, if applicable.</i></li> <li><i>in case of investments in infrastructure with an expected lifespan of at least five years, proof that an assessment of expected impacts of climate change has been carried out, or if not, it is ensured that it will be documented until ERDF contracting, but not later than 6 months after the approval by the MC.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Optional annexes (if relevant):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>annual report,</i></li> <li><i>registry/foundation documents.</i></li> </ol>	<p><i>Supporting documents if the staff flat rate is applied:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>declaration of the relevant institution about the number of employees covered by social insurance<sup>9</sup>.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Supporting documents for investment in infrastructure and works are not relevant for small-scale projects.</i></p> <p><i>Optional annexes (if relevant):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>annual report,</i></li> <li><i>registry/foundation documents.</i></li> </ol>	

<sup>9</sup> In Hungary: issued by the Kormányhivatal Családtámogatási és Társadalombiztosítási Főosztály, Egészségbiztosítási Osztály.  
In Austria: issued by the Krankenkasse.

<sup>10</sup> Depending on the ownership/rental conditions the proof of ownership/usage rights includes:

- Copies of land registry about the construction sites as listed in the application.
- If the construction site is not the property of the respective project partner, *additionally* the written agreement of the owner (acc. land registry) about the rental or the transfer of usage rights to the project partner. In case of institutional ownership, the documentation must be clearly compliant with the internal authorization procedures (e.g. attach municipal resolution, where relevant). Rights of use after project closure in compliance with article 65 of Regulation (EU) 1060/2021 must be also proven.





N <sup>o</sup> .	Administrative and eligibility criteria	Description for the checks by the Joint Secretariat		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
<b>B.3</b>	The application package is compiled in the required language(s).	<p><i>The following documents must be bilingual (German and Hungarian):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. application form (including additional English translation of the project summary),</li> <li>2. lead partner and partner declarations,</li> <li>3. partnership agreement.</li> </ol> <p><i>Other documents must be submitted in the native language of the partner concerned. If additional documents, studies (e.g. feasibility studies) are attached, they must include an executive summary in English.</i></p>		
<b>B.4</b>	Application form is correctly filled in.	<p><i>All applicable sections of the application form are correctly filled in:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All (relevant) fields of the application form include the required answer (there is no incorrect information, e.g. "to be added later").</li> <li>2. Language versions are identical (or at least no significant, obvious differences, missing parts are detectable).</li> </ol> <p><i>In case deficiencies are found, these have to be corrected in the course of the clarification round. The content of the application is not checked here, it is subject of the quality assessment.</i></p>		
<b>B.5</b>	Administrative and formal data in the application package are consistent.	<p><i>Information presented in the application form and its annexes is consistent (e.g. co-financing amounts, partner names etc.).</i></p>		
<b>B.6</b>	The lead partner is an eligible organisation.	<p><i>The lead partner is:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. national, regional or local public body (including EGTCs established in accordance with EGTC Regulation 1082/2006), public equivalent body, non-profit organisation or other institution which on project level acts in public interest,</li> <li>2. private institution, including private companies, having legal personality.</li> </ol> <p><i>The lead partner must be located</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. in the programme area,</li> <li>2. or if duly justified, outside the programme area provided that it has legally defined competences or field of functions for certain parts of the eligible area, such as a ministry.</li> </ol>		



Nº.	Administrative and eligibility criteria	Description for the checks by the Joint Secretariat		Yes or No
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects	
<b>B.7</b>	All project partners are eligible organisations.	<p><i>The partners are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>national, regional or local public bodies, public equivalent bodies (including EGTCs established in accordance with Regulation (EC) 1082/2006), non-profit organisations or other institutions which on project level act in public interest,</i></li> <li>2. <i>private institutions, including private companies, having legal personality.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Partners must be located</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>in the programme area,</i></li> <li>2. <i>or in justified cases outside the programme area, provided that they have legally defined competences or field of functions for certain parts of the programme area, such as ministries,</i></li> <li>3. <i>in only exceptional and duly justified cases outside the programme area.</i></li> </ol>	<p><i>The partners are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>national, regional or local public bodies, public equivalent bodies (including EGTCs established in accordance with Regulation (EC) 1082/2006), non-profit organisations or other institutions which on project level act in public interest,</i></li> <li>2. <i>private institutions, including private companies, having legal personality.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Partners must be located</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>in the programme area,</i></li> <li>2. <i>or in justified cases outside the programme area, provided that they have legally defined competences or field of functions for certain parts of the programme area, such as ministries.</i></li> </ol>	



## 2 Quality assessment

Based on the submitted application form (and its annexes), the Joint Secretariat (JS) assesses every project and produces a non-binding recommendation to the MC. The evaluation includes scores as well as descriptive comments to each criterion and a summary, including strengths, weaknesses and open questions with regard to the project. The purpose of the evaluation is to support the MC in its decision making. The right and responsibility to decide about project approval is the sole responsibility of the MC, whose decision may be different from the recommendation of the JS. Projects will be evaluated according to the criteria in the table below.

Scores between 0-3 are allocated to each evaluation criteria:

- 0=insufficient
- 1=low
- 2=sufficient
- 3=excellent

Each evaluation criterion has a weight of either 1 or 2, whereby a higher weight is given to those criteria that are considered by the MC to have more significance for the quality of the project. The weighted total score of the project is the product of score and weight for each question, summed up for all the criteria:

- *in case of standard projects* maximum 45 points for the strategic, as well as for the operational assessment criteria, altogether maximum 90 points,
- *in case of small-scale projects* maximum 45 points for the strategic, and maximum 36 points for the operational assessment criteria, altogether maximum 81 points.

The regional coordinators (RC), in exceptional cases external experts or relevant line ministries (also ones that are not represented in the MC) contribute to some criteria (marked in bold) with written comments. The JS consolidates these comments and, if needed, adds comments of its own and summarises the evaluation of these criteria by giving scores.

If the JS gives 0 points at any of the quality assessment criteria, they must give a justification and input for improvement. Giving 0 points in the quality assessment shall be a strong signal to the MC, meaning that there are serious problems with the project. The MC is expected to discuss these criteria, and approval may only be possible, if a sufficient answer can be given to the problem (either in the MC, in the form of a condition or in a resubmitted application).

Low scores received at the strategic and/or operational assessment criteria signal the poor quality of the application. As the strategic relevance of project applications and a clear added-value of the cross-border approach are at the core of the Interreg Austria-Hungary Programme, the importance of strategic criteria is mirrored accordingly by the setting of thresholds. Consequently, the project will be put on a risk list if it scores (weighted total)

in the case of a standard project

- 26 points or less in the strategic assessment criteria,
- 23 points or less in the operational assessment criteria,

and in the case of a small-scale project

- 26 points or less in the strategic assessment criteria,
- 19 points or less in the operational assessment criteria.

In such cases the decision of the MC has to be "rejection" or "postponing".



Table 3 Strategic assessment criteria

Assessment questions	Criteria for the assessment		Scores	Weight	Comments	Sections in AF
	Standard projects	Small-scale projects				
<p><b>Project's context (relevance and strategy)</b></p> <p><i>How well is a need for the project justified?</i></p>	S1.1	<p>The project addresses common territorial challenges of the programme (<i>incl. legal, administrative physical or perceived border obstacles</i>) or a joint asset of the programme area - there is a real need for the project (well justified, reasonable and well explained).                      With respect to the above, it represents added value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- either by demonstrating new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/programme area/participating countries,</li> <li>- or by adapting and implementing already developed solutions, while at the same time it capitalizes on (makes use of) available knowledge, builds on existing results and practices, using synergies and complementarity with past or current EU and other projects and initiatives.</li> </ul>	0-1-2-3	2		C.2.1 C.2.2 C.2.6 C.2.7
	S1.2	<p><b>The project clearly contributes to a wider strategy on one or more policy levels (EU / macroregional / national / regional).</b></p>	0-1-2-3	1		C.2.5
	S1.3	<p>The activities of the project clearly address one or more of the following horizontal principles and make a positive contribution to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- equal opportunities and non-discrimination, and/or</li> <li>- equality between men and women, and/or</li> <li>- environment protection and sustainable development.</li> </ul> <p>Negative effects or significant harm to any of these are to be avoided.</p>	0-1-2-3	1		C.7.6



Assessment questions		Criteria for the assessment		Scores	Weight	Comments	Sections in AF
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects				
<b>Cooperation character</b>  <i>What added value does the cooperation bring?</i>	S2.1	The importance of the cross-border approach to the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated: - the results cannot (or only to some extent) be achieved without cooperation and/or, - there is a clear benefit from cooperating for: · the project partners, · for target groups, · for the project/programme area.		0-1-2-3	2		C.2.3 C.2.4 B.1.6
	S2.2	At least 3 cooperation criteria are fulfilled: joint development (mandatory), joint implementation (mandatory), and joint staffing or joint financing. <b>Partner level consultation with the relevant regional coordinators is considered to be an advantage.</b>		0-1-2-3	1		C.7.5 D
<b>Project's contribution to programme targets</b>  <i>How well is the project internally constructed, and how it is embedded into the programme, and what impacts it is expected to make?</i>	S3.1	To what extent is the project intervention logic plausible?  - The project specific objective(s) of each work package are clear, realistic and achievable, they support the achievement of the overall objective. - The proposed outputs represent important achievements of the project and of the work package concerned, and contribute to the work package's specific objective. - Project outputs and results are realistic (it is possible to achieve them with the given resources -i.e. time, partners, budget- and they are feasible based on the quantification provided).		0-1-2-3	2		C.1, C.4, C.5, C.6, D
	<i>internal coherence of the project</i>	To what extent is the project intervention logic plausible?  - The project specific objective of the single work package is clear, realistic and achievable. - The proposed output(s) represent(s) important achievements of the project and contribute to the specific objective. - Project outputs and results are realistic (it is possible to achieve them with the given resources -i.e. time, partners, budget- and they are feasible based on the quantification provided).					



Assessment questions		Criteria for the assessment		Scores	Weight	Comments	Sections in AF
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects				
S3.2	<i>link between project and prg.</i>	To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme's objectives and indicators?	To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme's objectives and indicators?	0-1-2-3	2		C.1, C.4. C.5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project overall objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the programme priority specific objective.</li> <li>- The project outputs are clearly linked to programme output indicators and their contribution to programme targets is sufficient.</li> <li>- The project makes clear and sufficient contribution to the achievement of programme result indicators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project specific objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the programme priority specific objective.</li> <li>- The project outputs are clearly linked to programme output indicators and their contribution to programme targets is sufficient.</li> <li>- The project makes clear and sufficient contribution to the achievement of programme result indicators.</li> </ul>				
S3.3		To what extent will project outputs have an impact beyond project life time?		0-1-2-3	1		C.8.1, C.8.2, C.8.3
	S4.1	<b>The project involves the relevant actors needed to address the territorial challenge/joint asset and the objectives specified.</b>		0-1-2-3	1		B, C.3



Assessment questions		Criteria for the assessment		Scores	Weight	Comments	Sections in AF
		Standard projects	Small-scale projects				
<b>Partnership relevance and distribution of tasks</b>  <i>To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?</i>	S4.2	All partners play a defined and active role in the partnership. - In compliance with their role, partner organisations have proven competence and/or experience in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.). - The partnership is balanced (with respect to levels, sectors, territory) consists of partners that complement each other and the task distribution is clear and logical.		0-1-2-3	2		B.1.6, C.3, C.4
		<b>Maximal score</b>		<b>30</b>			
<b>Maximal weighted score:</b>					<b>45</b>		





Table 4 Operational assessment criteria

Assessment questions	Criteria for the assessment		Scores	Weight	Comments	Sections in AF	
	Standard projects	Small-scale projects					
<b>Work plan</b>	01.1	Proposed activities and deliverables are relevant and lead to the planned outputs and results.	0-1-2-3	2		C.4, C.5	
<i>To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?</i>	01.2	The importance of investments and their cross-border relevance is demonstrated to reach project objectives <sup>11</sup> .	0-1-2-3	1		C.4 Investment	
	01.3	Activities, deliverables and outputs are in a logical time-sequence, and the overall time plan is realistic (contingency included).	0-1-2-3	2		C.6	
	01.4	Project management (incl. the lead partner’s capacity and competence) is expected to ensure adequate and timely coordination, sufficient quality of content related implementation, involvement of all partners, reliable financial management and appropriate reporting.	0-1-2-3	1		B.1.6, C.7.1., C.7.2, C.7.4	
<b>Communication</b>	02.1	Communication objectives are relevant and are expected to make effective contribution to the project specific objectives.	0-1-2-3	2		C.4	
<i>To what extent are communication activities appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</i>	02.2	Communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders.	0-1-2-3	1		C.4, C.7.3	
<b>Budget</b>	03.1	Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation. The size of the project budget in general, and of its individual budget items specifically, are in line with the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.	Not applicable	0-1-2-3	2		D.2, E
<i>To what extent is the budget coherent and is in line with the principles</i>							

<sup>11</sup> In case there is no investment in the project 3 points are automatically allocated (no score is deducted).



Assessment questions	Criteria for the assessment		Scores	Weight	Comments	Sections in AF	
	Standard projects	Small-scale projects					
<i>of economy, efficiency and effectiveness?</i>	O3.2	The budget allocated to staff and external expertise (for both management and thematic tasks) is in line with the project content, the need for engaging external expertise is justified, and their costs are realistic.	Not applicable	0-1-2-3	1		D.2, E
	O3.3	Sufficient and reasonable costs are planned for investments (equipment purchases and infrastructure, if applicable) and their costs are realistic <sup>12</sup> .	Sufficient and reasonable costs are planned for investments and their costs are realistic <sup>12</sup> .	0-1-2-3	1		D.2, E
	O3.4	The available information in the budget and the link of individual budget items to the project activities is transparent and sufficient. On that basis, the project budget appears to be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in line with the proposed work plan,</li> <li>- proportionate to the project outputs and to the project's contribution to targeted programme indicators,</li> <li>- properly allocated across cost categories, periods,</li> <li>- appropriate and in line with the programme rules as far as the application of lump sums and unit costs is concerned.</li> </ul>		0-1-2-3	2		D.2, E
<b>Maximal score for standard projects / small-scale projects</b>			<b>30 / 24</b>				
<b>Maximal weighted score for standard projects / small-scale projects:</b>				<b>45 / 36</b>			

<sup>12</sup> In case there is no investment in the project 3 points are automatically allocated (no score is deducted).



### 3 Versions of the Selection Criteria and Methodology

Version number	Date	Content of the update
<b>1.0</b>	21.06.2023	-
<b>1.1</b>	30.10.2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to the contribution of MS/RC added in section 1</li> <li>• pre-submission check regarding unique acronyms skipped due to technical reasons</li> <li>• RC/MS contribution to the assessment reorganised (administrative/eligibility at B.1 and quality at S1.1)</li> <li>• criterium S4.2 aligned with the Small-Scale Project Application Form</li> <li>• criteria O1.2 and O3.3 applied also for SSP, in line with the Small-Scale Project Application Form</li> <li>• SSP assessment scores adjusted accordingly</li> </ul>
<b>2.0</b>	13.12.2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the overall threshold of 65 points for standard projects and 59 points for small-scale projects in the quality assessment was deleted</li> </ul>
<b>2.1</b>	07.05.2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• technical correction at S3.1 and S3.2: false reference to the overall objective at SSPs deleted.</li> </ul>